

there can be no doubt that its repudiation of the treaty was as politically unwise as it was morally unjustifiable.¹

During the last ten years of William's reign the civil government of Ireland was in various hands. First there were two Lords Justices, Coningsby and Porter.² When Coningsby was removed for embezzlement and extortion in 1692,³ Henry, Viscount Sydney, was named Lord Lieutenant. In 1695 Henry, Lord Capel, became Deputy Lord and in 1701 Lawrence Hyde, Earl of Rochester, was appointed Lord Lieutenant. During the whole period, whoever the nominal Lord Lieutenant or Deputy might be, the conduct of the government was in the hands of the Lords Justices, of whom, until his death at the end of 1696, the most important was Sir Charles Porter, and then probably Narcissus Marsh, Archbishop of Dublin. The correspondence of these various officials is included in the Calendar of State Papers, Domestic, published down to the end of 1698. Among the papers of the Duke of Buccleuch at Montagu House, calendared by the Historical Manuscripts Commission (1903), are many letters addressed to the Duke of Shrewsbury when Secretary of State, by Capel, Galway, and others, between about 1694 and 1700. On church matters during the same period, the papers of William King, successively Bishop of Derry

and Arch-
bishop of Dublin, shed new light.⁴

Another thorny question concerns the
restriction imposed by England upon the export of woollen
goods from
Ireland. Macaulay states that the act
imposing the restric-

¹ Cambridge Modern History, v (1908), 322.

^a Macaulay, IV, 1922 (xvi). ³ Ibid. V, 2309-10 (xix).

⁴ Hist, MSS, Comm., Second Report (1871), pp. 231-56.

Sir C. S. King's

A Great Archbishop of Dublin (1906) is mainly
autobiography and cor-
respondence.